

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application. Claims 1-29 are pending. Claims 1, 4, and 19-24 have been amended. No claims have been canceled or added.

The Examiner objected to the specification for informalities. The Office Action requested that Applicant adds a "Summary of the Invention" description to the application. However, Applicant would like to kindly point out that both the M.P.E.P. and 37 C.F.R. §1.73 do not require the presence of a "Summary of the Invention" in a patent application. They merely indicate where in the application the "Summary of the Invention" should be placed if Applicant were to elect to include one.

In particular, 37 C.F.R. §1.73 only states that "[a] brief summary of the invention ... should precede the detailed description." 37 CFR § 1.73 does not state "must" or "shall." Accordingly, Applicant has elected not to include a "Summary of the Invention" as this is within the discretion of Applicant. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the objection.

Claims 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant has amended the preambles of claims 19-24 as suggested in the Office Action. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments have overcome the rejection. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hanami (US Patent No. 6,122,317). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 1 as amended sets forth:

a motion measurement on a plurality of motion search points that form a rectangular search region, wherein a *minimal motion search point* among the plurality of motion search points is found based on result of the motion measurement;

(Claim 1 as amended; emphasis added)

In contrast, Hanami fails to disclose at least the above limitation. However, the Office Action argued the disclosure of estimating an *optimum motion vector* from a set of candidate motion vectors in Hanami, referring to Figure 1 in Hanami, is the same as the limitation set forth above (Office Action, p. 7, lines 3-7). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the analogy. An *optimum* motion vector is distinct and separate from a *minimal* motion search point. According to Hanami, candidate motion vectors of *high priority levels* are decided as optimum vectors using the motion vector detector shown in Figure 1 (Hanami, col. 11, lines 45-48). As such, rather than selecting a *minimal* motion search point as the optimum motion vector, Hanami discloses selecting motion vectors of *high* priority levels as the optimum vectors. Thus, Hanami does not disclose, suggest, or imply a minimal motion search point. For at least this reason, Hanami fails to anticipate claim 1 as amended. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 4, 7, 15, 19, and 25 are not anticipated by Hanami for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-3, 5-6, 8-14, 16-18, 20-24, and 26-29 depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 4, 7, 15, 19, and 25, respectively, and thus, include every limitation set forth in their respective base claims. Thus, claims 2-3, 5-6, 8-14, 16-18, 20-24, and 26-29 are not anticipated by Hanami for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, claim 8 is not anticipated by Hanami for the following reason as well. Claim 8 sets forth:

repositioning the rectangular search region to be substantially centered on the minimal motion search point and partially overlapping the rectangular search region ***if the minimal motion search point is along an edge or at a corner of the rectangular search region***, the repositioned rectangular search region including a second plurality of motion search points;

(Claim 8; emphasis added)

In contrast, Hanami fails to disclose the above limitation. Hanami merely discloses a template block 20 within a search area 22 (Hanami, Figure 5; col. 14, ln. 11-18). The Office Action analogized the template block to be the rectangular search region (Office Action, p. 6). Hanami further discloses that the search area 22 has horizontal and vertical search ranges of +t1 to -t2 and +r1 to -r2 (Hanami, Figure 5; col. 14, ln. 14-15). But Hanami does not disclose, suggest, or imply repositioning the rectangular search region, let alone repositioning the rectangular search region *if the minimal motion search point is along an edge or at a corner of the rectangular search region*. Therefore, Hanami fails to anticipate claim 8 for the above reason as well. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, claim 10 is not anticipated by Hanami for the following reason as well. Claim 10 sets forth:

dividing the rectangular search region into a plurality of data units, each of the plurality of data units having substantially the same size and a distinct subset of the plurality of motion search points, wherein the motion measurement is performed in each of the plurality of data units one by one.

(Claim 10; emphasis added)

In contrast, Hanami fails to disclose the above limitation. Hanami merely discloses a template block within a search area (Hanami, Figure 5; col. 14, ln. 11-18). The Office Action analogized the template block to be the rectangular search region (Office Action, p. 6). Hanami does not disclose, suggest, or imply dividing the rectangular search region into a set of data units, each data unit having substantially the same size and a distinct subset of motion search points, wherein the motion measurement is performed in each of the data unit one by one. Therefore, Hanami fails to anticipate claim 10 for the above reason as well. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, claim 13 is not anticipated by Hanami for the following reason as well. Claim 13 sets forth:

shrinking the rectangular search region at the minimal point if the minimal motion search point is within the inner region of the rectangular search region.

(Claim 13; emphasis added)

In contrast, Hanami fails to disclose the above limitation. Hanami merely discloses a template block 20 within a search area 22 (Hanami, Figure 5; col. 14, ln. 11-18). The Office Action analogized the template block to be the rectangular search region (Office Action, p. 6). Hanami further discloses that the search area 22 has horizontal and vertical search ranges of +t1 to -t2 and +r1 to -r2 (Hanami, Figure 5; col. 14, ln. 14-15). But Hanami does not disclose, suggest, or imply *shrinking the rectangular search region at the minimal point*, let alone shrinking the rectangular search region at the minimal point *if the minimal motion search point is within the inner region of the rectangular search region*. Therefore, Hanami fails to anticipate claim 13 for the above reason as well. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome by the remarks, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejections be withdrawn and the pending claims be allowed.


To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 is hereby made. If any other petition is necessary for consideration of this paper, it is hereby so petitioned.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 5/9, 2007



Chui-kiu Teresa Wong
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 48,042

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300